

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/532,320		COELINGH BENNINK ET AL.		
	Examiner		Art Unit		
	ANDRIAE M. HOLT		1616		

All Participants:

(1) ANDRIAE M. HOLT.

(2) William Logsdon, Attorney.

Date of Interview: 28 February 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Status of Application: Z1

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:00 pm

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner contacted Mr. Logsdon to inform him that in order to stay in the First Action Interview Pilot program, the response to the restriction requirement issued had to be without traverse. Mr. Logsdon will contact Applicant to see if Applicant wants to withdraw the traversal and remain in the program or keep the traversal and convert to the standard prosecution. 3/2/2011- Mr. Logsdon contacted the examiner to indicate Applicant will keep the traversal and drop out of the Pilot program. The Application will be processed under the standard prosecution.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)